

**ALTERNATIVE DEFINITIONS OF MEXICAN AND ARAB  
IDENTITY: AN EXAMINATION ACROSS THE TOP THREE  
CENSUS METROPOLITAN STANDARD AREAS OF  
CONCENTRATION**

by

Jen'nan Ghazal Read  
June 2007

Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D. is a Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Irvine. This work was developed under a subcontract with Sabre Systems, Inc. and utilized funds provided by the U.S. Census Bureau. The opinions expressed in this work are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of either Sabre Systems, Inc. or the Census Bureau.

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the  
Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

## ABSTRACT

This is the second and final report on the project that examines whether and how alternative definitions of group identity affect the size and characteristics of the Arab and Mexican populations in the United States. The first report (deliverable #3) used combined data from the 1 percent and 5 percent Public Use Microdata Samples in Census 2000 to examine this question at the national level. This report uses data from the 5 percent PUMS in Census 2000 to provide a more detailed examination of variations across alternative forms of identity in the top three Census Metropolitan Standard Areas of concentration (CMSA) for the Arab and Mexican populations. For the Arab population, the top three CMSAs are New York/Northern New Jersey/Long Island, Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County, and Detroit/Ann Arbor/Flint, and for the Mexican population, they are Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County, Chicago/Gary/Kenosha, and Houston/Galveston/Brazoria.

This report extends and elaborates on the prior report by focusing on three objectives: 1) to identify the top areas of geographic concentration (CMSA) for the Arab and Mexican populations using standard and alternative definitions of identity<sup>1</sup>; 2) to assess changes in the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of these two populations in the top three CMSAs when standard and alternative definitions of identity are used; 3) to summarize differences between the national profile and geographic profiles; and 4) to make recommendations to the U.S. Census Bureau regarding the utility of alternative definitions of identity.

In both reports, I use the standard Census method of classifying the Mexican and Arab populations (Hispanic origin and ancestry questions, respectively) as reference categories to explore differences across the range of possible permutations of identity. In the Arab case, I extend the standard ancestry classification to consider place of birth (Arab countries) and language (Arabic) (see Appendix A). Among these respondents, I analyzed all ancestry responses and excluded cases that clearly suggested that the persons were non-Arab. For example, if a person was born in an

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout the report and the tables, I use the term “standard definition” to refer to the Census definition of the Arab and Mexican populations, “alternative definition” to refer to the extended definition that I defined above, and “expanded definition” to refer to the combination of the standard and alternative definitions.

Arab country but listed “Italian” on the ancestry question, then he/she was excluded (see Appendix B for excluded categories). In the Mexican case, I extend the standard Hispanic origin definition to include place of birth (Mexico) and ancestry (Mexican, Chicano) (see Appendix C) and limited it to respondents who identify their Hispanic origin as ‘Other Spanish or Latino’ or ‘Not Hispanic Latino’ (see Appendix D). Spanish language can not be used to identify the Mexican population because it is a language shared with other Hispanic origin groups.<sup>2</sup>

This report is separated into two sections; the first section focuses on the Arab population and the second on the Mexican population. This organization to present the findings is used because there are unique methods for identifying each group, and the implications of using alternative definitions of identity are different for each group. Each section contains eight tables that are organized identically for clarity. Taking the Arab case as an example, the first table (A-1) lists the top 15 CMSAs for the Arab population using the standard Census definition and the second table (A-2) lists the same information using the expanded definition (standard definition plus alternative definition, which includes Arab place of birth and/or Arabic language at home). I then take the top three CMSAs using the Census definition and provide a more detailed demographic and socio-economic analysis that compares the standard and expanded definition groups in each specific locale (A-3 to A-8). There are two tables devoted to each of the three CMSAs and the logic of the pairing is as follows. The first table for each CMSA (A-3, A-5, A-7) assesses whether the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the alternative definition group are significantly different from those of the standard definition group (t-tests), and the second table for each CMSA (A-4, A-6, A-8) then examines whether combining the alternative definition group with the standard definition group changes the overall profile of the Arab population in that location.

## **The Arab Population**

Table A-1 lists the top fifteen CMSAs for the Arab population using the standard Census definition, and Table A-2 uses the expanded definition (standard definition plus alternative definition). In both tables, the New York/Northern New Jersey/Long

---

<sup>2</sup> An examination of write-in responses is beyond the scope of this project because it requires access to internal Census data.

Island CMSA (hereafter NY) is home to the largest Arab population at 14.0 percent and 14.1 percent, respectively, using the standard and expanded definitions. The Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County and Detroit/Ann Arbor/Flint CMSAs (hereafter LA and Detroit) have the next two largest concentrations, though the order is reversed in the tables. Using the standard Census definition, LA (9.4 percent) has the second largest population followed by Detroit (8.6 percent). Using the expanded definition, Detroit (9.7 percent) has the second largest population followed by LA (9.1 percent). The top three CMSAs (NY, LA, and Detroit) have about one third of the total Arab population for both the standard and expanded definitions. The Boston/Worcester/Lawrence CMSA, Chicago/Gary/Kenosha CMSA, Washington/Baltimore CMSA, and San Francisco/Oakland/San Jose CMSA each contain between 3 and 4 percent of the Arab population using the standard definition. Overall, the distribution of the Arab population across CMSAs is substantively the same in tables A-1 and A-2. The report next examines the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the Arab population in each of the top three CMSAs.

### ***New York/Northern New Jersey/Long Island***

Table A-3 compares the characteristics of the standard and alternative definition populations in the largest area of concentration for the Arab population (14.0 and 14.1 percent using the standard and expanded definition), New York/Northern New Jersey/Long Island CMSA (hereafter NY). The alternative definition population in NY (n=22,279) increases the size of the standard population by 13.6 percent. The alternative definition group is significantly less likely than the standard definition group to report being 'white alone or with another race' (80.7 percent compared to 95.5 percent) and significantly more likely to report being 'black' (10.5 percent compared to 1.6 percent).<sup>3</sup> The alternative definition group in NY has lower levels of educational attainment than the standard definition group. For example, 16.2 percent of the standard definition group has a graduate degree or higher compared to 12.2 percent of the alternative definition group. It is worth noting that both groups are well

---

<sup>3</sup> The confidence level used for determining statistical significance for this project is 95 percent or better ( $p < .05$ ). All comparisons are statistically significantly different (s.s.d.) unless otherwise stated at the  $p < .05$  level or better ( $p < .01$  and  $p < .001$ ).

educated, with 42.5 percent of the standard definition group and 28.2 percent of the alternative definition group having a bachelor's degree or higher. The alternative definition group in NY has a lower labor force participation rate (55.9 percent compared to 63.6 percent), higher unemployment rate (8.1 percent compared to 5.3 percent), higher poverty rate (20.9 percent compared to 16.1 percent) and works fewer hours (1819 vs. 1890 hours) than the standard definition group.<sup>4</sup>

Table A-4 next examines the extent to which adding the alternative definition group to the standard definition group changes the overall profile of the Arab population in New York. T-tests for differences between these groups are not appropriate because the expanded group contains the standard definition group (one is a subset of the other); thus the following comparisons cannot be tested to confirm that they are statistically significant from each other. The table shows that there are very few differences between the standard and expanded groups in New York, mainly because the alternative definition group is relatively small in number and thus has a minimal impact on the average characteristics. For example, the racial composition shifts slightly with a smaller proportion reporting 'white alone or with another race' and more reporting 'black.' Overall, adding the alternative definition group to the standard definition group shifts the population profile to more of a minority profile: non-white, lower educational attainment, higher unemployment rate, higher poverty rate, and lower median income. However, most of these changes are relatively small.

A more differentiated picture emerges when we compare the Arab population in NY to that at the national level (Appendix E, Table A-7 from first report). The NY group is more likely to be comprised of immigrants (51.7 percent are foreign born) compared to the national Arab population (39.9 percent). As might be expected given the immigrant composition of the population, a higher proportion of the NY Arab population speaks a language other than English at home (69.1 percent compared to 54.0 percent at the national level). The NY group has a slightly lower rate of labor force participation (63.6 percent compared to 64.9 percent at the national level), and a slightly higher unemployment rate (5.3 percent compared to 5.0 percent at the national level). The NY population has a higher median income at \$50,500 compared

---

<sup>4</sup> The comparisons in this sentence have different population universes and thus are not directly comparable. For example, the labor force participation rate is calculated for those 16 years and older, while the poverty rate includes the entire population.

to \$48,200 at the national level. This likely reflects the higher cost of living and higher incomes in NY relative to the national average.

### *Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County*

Table A-5 compares the characteristics of the standard and alternative definition populations in the second largest area of concentration (9.4 percent), Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County CMSA (hereafter LA). As is the case in NY, the alternative definition group is significantly less likely than the standard definition group to report being ‘white alone or with another race’ (91.1 percent compared to 96.7 percent) and has lower levels of educational attainment across the spectrum, from high school graduate to graduate degree or higher. The alternative definition group has a much lower civilian labor force participation rates than the standard definition group (51.1 percent compared to 61.0 percent), works fewer hours (1764 compared to 1891 hours), and has a higher proportion ‘not in labor force’ (48.9 percent compared to 39.0 percent). Likewise, the alternative definition group has a higher poverty rate than the standard LA group (19.0 percent compared to 12.1 percent).

Table A-6 next examines the extent to which adding the alternative definition group to the standard definition group changes the overall profile of the Arab population in LA.<sup>5</sup> Overall, there are very few differences between the standard and expanded groups in LA, in part because the expanded group is merely the standard definition group plus the alternative definition group, and the latter is small in number (10,453) and therefore has a minimal impact on the average characteristics.

Once again, more distinctions emerge when we compare the LA Arab population to that at the national level using the standard census definition for both groups (Appendix E). Using the standard Census definition for both the LA and national populations, the LA group has a higher proportion foreign born (54.1 percent) than

---

<sup>5</sup> Again, t-tests for differences between these groups are not appropriate because the expanded group contains the standard definition group (one is a subset of the other), and the comparisons in this paragraph cannot be tested to confirm that they are statistically significant from each other.

national Arab population (39.9 percent), which is similar to the NY case where there was also a higher proportion foreign-born compared to the national population. The LA population also has a higher proportion who speaks a language other than English at home (69.0 percent compared to 54.0 percent at the national level), a lower rate of labor force participation (61.0 percent compared to 64.9 percent), and a higher unemployment rate (6.9 percent compared to 5.0 percent at the national level). At the same time, the LA population has a higher median income (\$51,500 compared to \$48,200 at the national level). These differences are larger than those found between the NY and national population. Overall, the LA Arab population is most differentiated from the national Arab population with respect to immigrant composition and characteristics that are linked to immigration (e.g. language at home).

### ***Detroit/Ann Arbor/Flint***

The report now turns to the third largest concentration of the Arab population (8.6 percent), which is located in the Detroit/Ann Arbor/Flint CMSA (hereafter Detroit). Table A-7 compares the characteristics of the standard and alternative definition groups in Detroit. Unlike the case of LA and NY, the alternative definition group in Detroit is very similar to the standard definition group in terms of racial composition with 96.2 percent and 98.8 percent reporting white, respectively. The two groups are also similar in their labor force activity rates (55.7 percent and 58.6 percent), which is also distinct from the LA and NY cases where the standard definition groups had significantly higher levels of employment than the alternative definition groups. The most notable difference between the Detroit alternative and standard definition groups is their educational attainment. The alternative definition group has much lower levels of educational attainment across the categories: 48.5 percent have a high school diploma compared to 72.5 percent of the standard definition group; 14.4 percent have a bachelor's degree or higher compared to 27.6 percent of the standard definition group; and 4.8 percent have a graduate degree or higher compared to 11.9 percent of the standard definition group.

Table A-8 next examines the extent to which adding the alternative definition group to the standard definition group changes the overall profile of the Arab population in

Detroit.<sup>6</sup> The picture for Detroit is again quite distinct from that of LA and NY, where adding the alternative definition group to the standard definition group in these two CMSAs had relatively little impact on the groups' overall profile. In the Detroit case, the alternative definition group is sizeable and thus has a bigger impact on the population profile: when I add the alternative definition group to the standard definition group, the Detroit Arab population increases by 28.5 percent (the Detroit standard definition group is 100,507 and the Detroit expanded group is 129,134). For NY, the increase is less than half the size at 13.5 percent and for LA the increase is only 9.4 percent. Thus, Table A-8 shows that the alternative definition group has a fairly sizeable impact on the population's profile with respect to immigrant composition, educational attainment, and English language ability. The majority of the Detroit expanded group is foreign born (52.2 percent compared to 43.2 percent for the Detroit standard definition group) and speaks a language other than English in the home (72.3 percent compared to 64.7 percent at the national level). The expanded definition group also has lower levels of educational attainment than the standard definition group (66.0 percent and 72.5 percent have a high school diploma, respectively) and is slightly less likely to be in the labor force (57.9 percent in the labor force compared to 58.6 percent).

A comparison of the Detroit population with the national profile of Arabs is also informative (compare with Table A-7 in first report). Using the standard Census definition for both groups, the Detroit population is slightly more likely to report being 'white alone or with another race' (98.8 percent compared to 96.6 percent at the national level). Unlike the case of NY and LA, the size of the foreign-born population in Detroit is quite similar to that at the national level (43.2 percent and 39.9 percent, respectively). Recall that immigrants comprised more than one-half the Arab populations in both NY and LA. The Detroit population has a lower socioeconomic profile than the national Arab population, across the various indicators of attainment. The national average for the Arab population for a bachelor's degree or higher is 41.8 percent compared to 27.6 percent in Detroit; the employment rate at the national level is 61.6 percent compared to only 55.3 percent in Detroit; the poverty rate at the national level is 13.3 percent compared to 19.5 percent in Detroit; and the median income at the national level is \$48,200 compared to \$42,000 in Detroit. Similar to the Arab populations in NY and LA, the Arab population in Detroit is more

---

<sup>6</sup> Because t-tests are not appropriate for these groups, the comparisons in this paragraph cannot be tested to confirm that they are statistically significant from each other.

heavily comprised of immigrants with lower socioeconomic statuses than the Arab population overall.

### ***Summary of Geographic Variation for the Arab Population***

There are several noteworthy differences in the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of the Arab population in the top three areas of concentration compared to the national profile of the Arab population. In general, the three CMSAs have a higher proportion foreign born and a higher proportion who speak a language other than English in the home, probably because these areas are high immigrant receiving areas (New York, Los Angeles, and Detroit). New York and Los Angeles are well-known immigrant ports, in general, and Detroit is particularly attractive to Arab immigrants because of the density of the Arab population and the availability of ethnic enclaves (the Arab population in other locales is often more dispersed).<sup>7</sup>

Indeed, the Detroit Arab population looks quite distinct from both the national profile of the Arab population and the NY and LA Arab populations. All three groups have lower labor force participation rates than the national average, but the Detroit population seems particularly disadvantaged in this regard. Detroit also has lower levels of educational attainment than the national average, while the LA and NY populations are not too dissimilar from the national average. Similarly, the LA and NY groups have higher median incomes than the national average, while again, the Detroit population has a lower median income. The uniqueness of the Detroit population partly reflects the fact that 50.4 percent of the foreign-born population arrived in the United States since 1990, compared to 43.7 percent of the NY population and 31.2 percent of the LA population. The higher composition of newer immigrants likely drives down the overall socioeconomic profile of the Detroit population, relative to other areas around the country.

### **The Mexican Population**

---

<sup>7</sup> For reference, see Baker, Wayne, Sally Howell, Amaney Jamal, Ann Chih Lin, Andrew Shryock, Ron Stockton, and Mark Tessler. 2004. "Preliminary Findings from the Detroit Arab American Study." Available on-line at <http://www.isr.umich.edu/news/arab-amer/final-report.pdf>

This section of the report focuses on the top areas of concentration for the Mexican population (Tables M-1 to M-8). Table M-1 lists the top fifteen CMSAs for the Mexican population using the standard Census definition, and Table M-2 uses the expanded definition (i.e., standard definition plus alternative definition, which is Mexican ancestry and/or place of birth). In both tables, the Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County CMSA (hereafter LA) has by far the largest concentration of the Mexican population with 24.1 percent and 23.7 percent respectively using the standard and expanded definitions. The second largest area of concentration for the Mexican population can be found in the Chicago/Gary/Kenosha CMSA (hereafter Chicago), and the size is much smaller at 5.4 percent and 5.2 percent using the standard and expanded definitions, respectively. The third largest concentration is located in the Houston/Galveston/Brazoria CMSA (hereafter Houston), where the size of the population is 4.8 percent using the standard and expanded definitions. These top three CMSAs are home to about one third of the total Mexican population in the United States, and overall, the distribution of the Mexican population across the CMSAs are substantively the same using the standard and expanded definitions. The report next examines the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the Mexican population in each of the top three CMSAs using alternative definitions of identity (standard, alternative, and expanded).

### ***Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County***

Table M-3 compares the characteristics of the standard and alternative definition Mexican populations in the largest area of concentration in the United States (24.1 percent), Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County CMSA (hereafter LA). The alternative definition group is less than one-tenth (7.8 percent) the size of the standard definition group (394,675 compared to 5,033,233). The racial composition of the alternative definition group is significantly different from that of the standard definition group, with 47.9 percent of the alternative definition group reporting ‘white alone or with another race’ (compared to 45.4 percent of the standard definition group) and 46.4 percent reporting ‘other race alone’ (compared to 52.2 percent of the standard definition group). The socioeconomic status of the alternative definition group is also significantly different (lower) than that of the standard definition group

in terms of labor force participation and poverty. The alternative definition group has a lower employment rate (46.6 percent compared to 54.1 percent of the standard definition group) and a higher poverty rate (23.8 percent compared to 22.6 percent). However, the alternative and standard definition groups do not significantly differ from each other in terms of their educational attainments. For example, 5.9 percent of the standard definition group and 6.0 percent of the alternative definition group have a bachelor's degree or higher.

Table M-4 next examines whether and how adding the alternative definition group to the standard definition group changes the overall profile of the Mexican population in LA. T-tests for differences between these groups are not appropriate because the expanded group contains the standard definition group (one is a subset of the other). The characteristics of the standard and expanded groups are very similar, probably due to small size of the LA alternative definition group (similar to the case for the Arab population). When we include the alternative definition group, the size of the Mexican population in LA increases by 7.8 percent (5,033,233 vs. 5,427,908). Thus, there are few changes in the overall demographic and socioeconomic characteristics when comparing these two groups. Taking the poverty rate as an example, 22.6 percent of the standard definition group and 22.7 of the expanded group (standard plus alternative) fall below the poverty threshold.

A more telling story lies in the comparison of the Mexican population in LA to that of the Mexican population at the national level (compare with Table B-6 in first report). Using the standard Census definition in both LA and the national level, we see that the Mexican population in LA is much less likely to report being 'white alone or with another race' (45.4 percent compared to 51.6 percent at the national level), more likely to be foreign born (44.6 percent compared to 41.5 percent at the national level), and among the foreign born, there is a higher proportion who entered prior to 1990 (62.5 percent compared to 51.1 percent at the national level). The socioeconomic profile of the LA population is slightly lower than that at the national level. In terms of educational attainment, 42.1 percent have a high school diploma or higher (compared to 45.8 percent at the national level), 5.9 percent have a bachelor's degree or higher (compared to 7.5 percent at the national level), and 1.9 percent have a graduate degree or higher (compared to 2.4 percent at the national level). The LA population is also less likely to be in the civilian labor force (59.6 percent compared

to 61.8 percent), more likely to be in poverty (22.6 percent compared to 23.2 percent). At the same time, the LA population has slightly higher median incomes at \$36,500 compared to \$33,500 at the national level, which may reflect differences in local labor market factors (i.e., higher cost of living in southern California relative to the national average).

### ***Chicago/Gary/Kenosha***

Table M-5 compares the characteristics of the standard and alternative definition populations in the second largest area of concentration for the Mexican population (5.4 percent), Chicago/Gary/Kenosha CMSA (hereafter Chicago). The size of the alternative definition group is relatively small compared to the standard definition group, adding only 5.3 percent to the population size. Similar to the alternative definition Mexican population in LA, the alternative definition population in Chicago is significantly more likely than the standard definition group to report being ‘white alone or with another race’ (55.4 percent compared to 50.0 percent) and less likely to report being ‘other race alone’ (38.8 percent compared to 47.9 percent). Unlike the LA case, the socioeconomic status of the alternative definition group is significantly higher rather than lower than that of the standard definition group. The proportion with at least a high school diploma is 57.0 percent for alternative definition group and 43.5 percent for the standard definition group; 10.9 percent of the alternative definition group has a bachelor’s degree or higher compared to 6.3 percent of the standard definition group; and 3.6 percent of the alternative definition group has a graduate degree or higher compared to 2.0 percent of the standard definition group. The alternative definition group is slightly less likely to be in the civilian labor force (61.7 percent compared to 63.9 percent), but there is no significant difference between the two groups in terms of poverty rate (15.7 percent of the alternative definition group and 16.0 percent of the standard definition group).

As mentioned above, the alternative definition group is relatively small (n=60,239), thus the addition of the population to the standard definition group does little to change the overall profile of the Mexican population in Chicago (comparing standard and expanded group characteristics in Table M-6). For example, 50.0 percent of the standard definition group and 50.3 percent of the expanded definition group report being ‘white alone or with another race.’ However, there are some changes worth

noting, despite their relatively small size. The expanded definition group is slightly more likely to be native-born, has higher educational attainments, higher median incomes, and is more likely to be occupied in professional/managerial positions than the standard definition group. The relatively small size of these changes is a function of the small size of the alternative definition group.

Using the standard Census definition, the Mexican population in Chicago is less likely to report being ‘white alone or with another race’ (50.0 percent compared to 51.6 percent) and has a higher proportion foreign born (51.4 percent) than both the Mexican populations in LA (44.6 percent) and the national level (41.5 percent, see Table B-6 in first report). The Chicago population also has a higher percentage of persons who speak a language other than English at home (86.0 percent compared to 78.8 percent at the national level) and who do not speak English very well (51.3 percent compared to 43.1 percent at the national level). Moreover, the Mexican population in Chicago has a higher percentage of persons living in linguistically isolated households (32.3 percent compared to 26.4 percent at the national level), all of which points to a relatively disadvantaged position in the economy. Indeed, despite having a slightly higher rate of participation in the civilian labor force (63.9 percent compared to 61.8 percent at the national level), the Mexican population in Chicago is less likely to be employed in managerial/professional occupations (11.3 percent compared to 15.0 percent at the national level). On the other hand, the Chicago population is less likely to be in poverty (16.0 percent compared to 23.2 percent at the national level) and has a higher median income (\$41,600 compared to \$33,500 at the national level).

### ***Houston/Galveston/Brazoria***

The report next turns to the third largest area of concentration for the Mexican population (4.8 percent), Houston/Galveston/Brazoria CMSA (hereafter Houston). Table M-7 shows that the alternative definition group increases the size of the standard definition group by 9.8 percent, which is a larger increase than for the other two CMSAs in this report (LA and Chicago). Demographic and socioeconomic differences between the alternative and standard definition groups in Houston are also quite distinct from the LA and Chicago cases. The proportion reporting ‘white alone

or with another race' is *lower* for the alternative definition group than for the standard definition group in Houston (53.9 percent compared to 56.4 percent), whereas it was higher for the alternative definition groups in LA and Chicago compared to the standard definition groups. There is also a higher percentage who report being 'black' (2.4 percent compared to 0.6 percent of the standard definition group). The alternative definition group is more well educated than the standard definition group, with 49.8 percent having a high school diploma or higher and 7.5 percent having a bachelor's degree or higher (compared to 42.2 percent and 6.6 respectively for the standard definition group). They are also significantly less likely to be in poverty (20.0 percent compared to 22.0 percent), despite having a slightly higher rate of unemployment (9.9 percent compared to 8.0 percent for the standard definition group).

Table M-8 next compares the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the standard definition group to that of the expanded group. The story here is similar to that of previous comparisons in other geographic locations for both the Arab and Mexican populations: the relatively small size of the alternative definition group has a limited impact on the overall profile of the group, thus the characteristics of the standard and expanded definition groups in Houston are very similar. However, similar to the case in Chicago, there are some minor shifts that are worth noting. The expanded definition group is slightly more likely to be native-born, has higher educational attainments, higher median incomes, and is more likely to be occupied in professional/managerial positions than the standard definition group. Again, the size of these changes is merely a function of the small size of the alternative definition group. The overall story is that adding the alternative definition group to the standard definition group slightly advantages the profile of the Mexican population in Houston in terms of socioeconomic status.

Finally, a comparison of the Mexican population in Houston to that at the national level reveals several important distinctions (Appendix F). First, the Houston population has a higher proportion reporting 'white alone or with another race' compared to the other two CMSAs in this report and to the national average (56.4 percent compared to 45.4 percent in LA, 50.0 percent in Chicago, and 51.6 percent at the national level). This may partly reflect the fact that the Houston population has the lowest proportion foreign-born at 42.8 percent compared to 44.6 percent in LA, 51.4 percent in Chicago, and 41.5 percent at the national level (i.e., native-born persons may be more likely than the foreign-born to consider themselves part of the

majority white population). The socioeconomic profile of the Mexican population in Houston relative to that at the national level is mixed. On the one hand, the group has slightly lower levels of educational attainment (42.2 percent have a high school diploma or higher compared to 45.8 percent at the national level), and lower levels of civilian labor force participation (60.1 percent compared to 61.8 percent at the national level). On the other hand, the Houston population has a lower poverty rate (22.0 percent compared to 23.2 percent at the national level), a lower unemployment rate (8.0 percent compared to 9.3 percent at the national level), and relatively similar median incomes given the lower cost of living in Houston relative to other large cities nationally (\$32,800 compared to \$33,500 at the national level).

### ***Summary of Geographic Variation for the Mexican Population***

The socioeconomic and demographic profiles of the Mexican populations in the top three areas of geographic concentration are distinct from that at the national level. First, each of the three CMSAs has a higher proportion foreign-born than the national average of 41.5 percent, and this is especially true in Chicago where immigrants are a slight majority at 51.4 percent. The Mexican population in each of the top three CMSAs also has a lower level of educational attainment and is less likely to occupy professional/managerial positions compared to the national level, although the LA population is quite similar to the national population in this regard (14.6 percent compared to 15.0 percent, respectively). The LA and Chicago populations have a lower percentage reporting 'white alone or with another race' and higher median incomes than the national population, while the Houston population has higher percentage reporting 'white alone or with another race' and lower median incomes than the national group. Unlike the case for the Arab population, it is difficult to make generalizations because there are no clear cut findings that differentiate the three CMSAs from the national average. Depending on specific measure of socioeconomic status (education, employment, poverty rate), the findings for each group vary in each location.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This report is the second and final report on the project that examines the extent to which using alternative definitions of group identity affect the size and characteristics of the Mexican and Arab populations in the United States. The first report examined this question at the national level, and the current report focuses on the top three areas of geographic concentration for each of the groups.

In the Arab case, the results at the national level (first report) showed that adding the alternative definition group (persons born in an Arab country and/or who spoke Arabic in the home but did not provide an Arab response to the ancestry question) to the standard definition group increased the size of the Arab population by 13.0 percent. This report finds that the proportionate size of the alternative definition group varies considerably by geographic area of concentration. In the largest CMSA (NY, home to 14.0 percent of the Arab population), the alternative definition group increases the size of the standard definition group by 13.5 percent, and in the second largest CMSA (LA, home to 9.4 percent of the Arab population), the increase is 9.4 percent. However, the increase is 28.5 percent in the third largest area of concentration (Detroit, home to 8.6 percent of the Arab population), more than double that in the NY and LA CMSAs.

The demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of persons in the alternative definition group are generally similar at the national level and the three CMSAs. On average, they are newer immigrants, less educated, and more likely to be in poverty than the Arab population as a whole. Again, the size of the disadvantage varies by geographic locale. For example, the alternative definition group in Detroit is considerably more disadvantaged than the standard definition group in terms of educational attainment, while the gap between the alternative and standard definition groups is much smaller in NY and LA. On the other hand, the alternative definition group in Detroit has a lower poverty rate compared to the standard definition group, while the opposite is true in NY and LA. Looking at the overall profile of the Arab populations in each of the three CMSAs is also instructive (i.e., in addition to comparing the alternative and standard definition groups). The LA and NY Arab populations are more likely to be native born, better educated, and in professional/managerial occupations when compared to the Detroit Arab population. Overall, these findings underscore the need to examine different geographic regions

and to use multiple measures of socioeconomic status in to provide an accurate and comprehensive profile of the Arab population.

The results for the Mexican population are quite different from those for the Arab population, both at the national level and in the top three areas of geographic concentration. At the national level, the first report (deliverable #3) showed that adding the alternative definition group (persons who responded with a Mexican ancestry and/or were born in Mexico but did not respond to the Hispanic origin question) to the standard definition group increased the size of the Mexican population by 9.8 percent (cumulative percent). Whereas the impact of the alternative definition group was as high as 28.5 percent for the Arab population (Detroit), the impact of the alternative definition group on the Mexican population in the top three CMSAs is much smaller ranging from a low of 5.3 percent in Chicago to a high of 9.8 percent in Houston.

At the national level, persons in the alternative definition categories (especially the ancestry respondents) were more educated and less likely to be in poverty than the Mexican population as a whole. Again in contrast to the Arab case, there was more variability between the national profile and the three CMSAs. The alternative definition groups in Houston and Chicago are better educated than the standard definition group, but in LA, there is no significant difference between the two. The poverty rate is also higher for the alternative definition group in LA (relative to the standard definition group in LA), whereas it is lower for the alternative definition group in Houston and not significantly different in Chicago. Comparing the overall profile of the Mexican populations in each of the three CMSAs is also instructive (i.e., in addition to comparing the alternative and standard definition groups). The Mexican population in LA has the lowest proportion reporting 'white alone or with another race' and highest rate of unemployment. The Mexican population in Chicago, on the other hand, has a much lower rate of unemployment and is much less likely to be in poverty compared to both the LA and Houston populations. Again, these findings highlight the utility of differentiating a population's profile by geographic locale and of using multiple indicators of attainment.

In both the Arab and Mexican cases, adding the alternative definition group to the standard definition group (i.e., expanded group) had a minor impact on the overall demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the population in each of the top

three CMSAs of concentration. As was the case at the national level, this mainly reflects the relatively small size of the alternative definition group as compared to the large size of the standard definition group. In other words, adding the alternative definition group to the larger pool has a minimal impact on the average characteristics of the Arab and Mexican populations as whole. However, this is not to downplay the possible future impact of the alternative definition group on the larger population. If the alternative definition groups grow at a faster pace than the larger population, their impact will also grow. Future research will need to monitor these changes and assess the implications for classifying America's ethnic populations. If the current patterns continue, the implications for the Arab population is that the most socio-economically disadvantaged may be missed in standard classification methods. The opposite would be true for the Mexican population, where the more affluent are not captured.

**Table A-1. Arab population by Top-15 CMSA/MSA, Standard Census Definition<sup>1</sup>**

	<b>CMSA</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1	New York, Northern New Jersey, Long Island (CMSA)	164,388	14.0
2	Los Angeles, Riverside, Orange County (CMSA)	110,663	9.4
3	Detroit, Ann Arbor, Flint (CMSA)	100,507	8.6
4	Boston, Worcester, Lawrence, (CMSA)	45,542	3.9
5	Chicago, Gary, Kenosha (CMSA)	45,219	3.9
6	Washington, Baltimore (CMSA)	44,359	3.8
7	San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose (CMSA)	39,572	3.4
8	Miami, Fort Lauderdale (CMSA)	26,045	2.2
9	Cleveland, Akron (CMSA)	22,393	1.9
10	Dallas, Fort Worth (CMSA)	21,035	1.8
11	Houston, Galveston, Brazoria (CMSA)	20,994	1.8
12	Philadelphia, Wilmington, Atlantic City (CMSA)	19,188	1.6
13	San Diego (MSA)	18,048	1.5
14	Pittsburgh (MSA)	13,157	1.1
15	Atlanta (MSA)	12,777	1.1
	Sub-total	703,887	60.1
	Not in a metropolitan area	58,292	5.0
	Total Arab population (standard)	1,171,674	

<sup>1</sup> Source: 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, Census 2000

**Table A-2. Arab population by Top-15 CMSA/MSA, Expanded Definition<sup>1,2</sup>**

	<b>CMSA</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1	New York, Northern New Jersey, Long Island (CMSA)	186,667	14.1
2	Detroit, Ann Arbor, Flint (CMSA)	129,134	9.7
3	Los Angeles, Riverside, Orange County (CMSA)	121,116	9.1
4	Chicago, Gary, Kenosha (CMSA)	58,445	4.4
5	Washington, Baltimore (CMSA)	53,560	4.0
6	Boston, Worcester, Lawrence, (CMSA)	48,435	3.7
7	San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose (CMSA)	44,354	3.3
8	Miami, Fort Lauderdale (CMSA)	27,662	2.1
9	Houston, Galveston, Brazoria (CMSA)	23,738	1.8
10	San Diego (MSA)	23,717	1.8
11	Dallas, Fort Worth (CMSA)	23,619	1.8
12	Cleveland, Akron (CMSA)	23,346	1.8
13	Philadelphia, Wilmington, Atlantic City (CMSA)	21,936	1.7
14	Phoenix, Mesa (MSA)	14,838	1.1
15	Atlanta (MSA)	14,032	1.1
	Sub-total	814,599	61.3
	Not in a metropolitan area	63,888	4.8
	<b>Total Arab population (expanded)</b>	<b>1,328,610</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Expanded definition includes Standard Census Definition plus Arab place of birth and/or Arabic language at home

<sup>2</sup> Source: 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, Census 2000

**Table A-3. Sociodemographic Differences Between Standard and Alternative Arab Identity Groups, New York/Northern New Jersey/Long Island<sup>1</sup>**

	<b>STANDARD DEFINITION</b> (1 <sup>st</sup> and/or 2 <sup>nd</sup> ancestry reported)			<b>ALTERNATIVE DEFINITION</b> (Place of birth and/or Language)			
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>		<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>		<b>P-value</b>
<b>Population</b>	164,388			22,279			
<b>Race</b>							
White alone or with another race	156,943	95.5 %		17,970	80.7 %		P<.0001
Black	2,668	1.6 %		2,336	10.5 %		P<.0001
Asian	1,362	0.8 %		1,070	4.8 %		P<.0001
Hawaii/PI/Native Am	220	0.1 %		106	0.5 %		P=.259
Other race alone	2,675	1.6 %		523	2.4 %		P<.05
All other combinations	520	0.3 %		274	1.2 %		P<.05
<b>Educational attainment</b>							
Persons 25 years and over	99,751			14,670			
High school graduate or higher	84,190	84.4 %		11,378	77.6 %		P<.0001
Bachelor's degree or higher	42,352	42.5 %		4,139	28.2 %		P<.0001
Graduate degree or higher	16,155	16.2 %		1,791	12.2 %		P<.01
<b>Labor force status</b>							
Persons 16 years and over	119,426			17,315			
In civilian labor force	75,937	63.6 % <sup>a</sup>		9,677	55.9 % <sup>a</sup>		P<.0001
Employed (in civilian labor force)	71,887	60.2 % <sup>a</sup>		8,895	51.4 % <sup>a</sup>		P<.0001
Unemployed (in civilian labor force)	4,050	5.3 % <sup>b</sup>		782	8.1 % <sup>b</sup>		P<.05
Not in labor force	43,475	36.4 % <sup>a</sup>		7,638	44.1 % <sup>a</sup>		P<.0001
Mean hours worked (hours worked in 1999)		1890.0 <sup>c</sup>			1819.1 <sup>c</sup>		P=.122

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

<b>Poverty rate</b>					
All Persons (in household)		16.1 %		4,512	20.9 % P<.0001
<b>Age and sex</b>					
Male	91,193	55.5 %		12,505	56.1 % P=.945
Mean age		31.4			33.8 P<.0001

a= Among those 16 years or older

b= Among those 16 years or older and in civilian labor force

c= Among those 16 years or older and employed

<sup>1</sup> Source: 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, Census 2000

**Table A-4. Sociodemographic Differences Between Standard and Expanded Arab Definitions, New York/Northern New Jersey/Long Island<sup>1</sup>**

	<u>STANDARD DEFINITION</u> (1 <sup>st</sup> and/or 2 <sup>nd</sup> ancestry reported)			<u>EXPANDED DEFINITION</u> (1 <sup>st</sup> and/or 2 <sup>nd</sup> ancestry; Place of birth; Language)		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	
<b>Race</b>	164,388	100.0	%	186,667	100.0	%
White alone or with another race	156,943	95.5	%	174,913	93.7	%
Black	2,668	1.6	%	5,004	2.7	%
Asian	1,362	0.8	%	2,432	1.3	%
Hawaii/PI/Native Am	220	0.1	%	326	0.2	%
Other race alone	2,675	1.6	%	3,198	1.7	%
All other combinations	520	0.3	%	794	0.4	%
<b>Nativity and year of entry</b>						
All persons	164,388	100.0	%	186,667	100.0	%
Native	79,329	48.3	%	85,994	46.1	%
Foreign born	85,059	51.7	%	100,673	53.9	%
Entered before 1990	47,853	56.3	% <sup>a</sup>	55,495	55.1	% <sup>a</sup>
Entered between 1990-2000	37,206	43.7	% <sup>a</sup>	45,178	44.9	% <sup>a</sup>
Citizenship status						
Naturalized citizen	45,069	53.0	% <sup>a</sup>	52,084	51.7	% <sup>a</sup>
Not a citizen	39,990	47.0	% <sup>a</sup>	48,589	48.3	% <sup>a</sup>
<b>Educational attainment</b>						
Persons 25 years and over	99,751			114,421		
High school graduate or higher	84,190	84.4	%	95,568	83.5	%
Bachelor's degree or higher	42,352	42.5	%	46,491	40.6	%
Graduate degree or higher	16,155	16.2	%	17,946	15.7	%
<b>Ability to speak English</b>						
Persons 5 years and over	148,455			170,385		

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

Speak other language at home	102,534	69.1 %	122,219	71.7 %
Do not speak English very well	39,423	26.6 % <sup>b</sup>	47,476	27.9 % <sup>b</sup>
Persons 5 years and over in households	146,954		168,234	
In linguistically isolated households	20,564	14.0 %	24,459	14.5 %
<b>Labor force status</b>				
Persons 16 years and over	119,426		136,741	
In civilian labor force	75,937	63.6 %	85,614	62.6 %
Employed (in civilian labor force)	71,887	60.2 % <sup>c</sup>	80,782	59.1 % <sup>c</sup>
Unemployed (in civilian labor force)	4,050	5.3 % <sup>d</sup>	4,832	5.6 % <sup>d</sup>
Not in labor force	43,475	36.4 % <sup>c</sup>	51,113	37.4 % <sup>c</sup>
Mean hours worked (hours worked in 1999)		1890.0 <sup>e</sup>		1882.2 <sup>e</sup>
<b>Occupation</b>				
Employed persons 16 years and over	71,901	100.0 %	80,796	100.0 %
Management, professional, related occupations	28,720	39.9 %	31,440	38.9 %
Service	8,465	11.8 %	9,809	12.1 %
Sales and office	23,116	32.2 %	26,046	32.2 %
Other	11,586	16.1 %	13,487	16.7 %
Military	14	0.0 %	14	0.0 %
<b>Income in 1999</b>				
Households				
Median income (dollars)	50,500		49,700	
Mean income (dollars)	75,619		74,293	
<b>Poverty rate (all persons in household)</b>		16.1 %		16.6 %
<b>Household size</b>				
Average number of persons in household		3.2		3.1
<b>Marital status</b>				
Persons 15 years and over	121,464	100.0 %	139,355	100.0 %
Now married	74,129	61.0 %	83,732	60.1 %
Widowed/Divorced/Separated	12,739	10.5 %	14,961	10.7 %

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

Never married	34,596	28.5 %	40,662	29.2 %
<b>Number of own children under 18 years old living in household for women age 35-44<sup>f</sup></b>		2.0		2.0
<b>Age and sex</b>				
Male	91,193	55.5 %	103,698	55.6 %
Mean age		31.4		31.7
a= Among foreign born people	d= Among 16 years or older in civilian labor force			
b= Among 5 years or older.	e= Among 16 years or older and employed			
c= Among 16 years or older	f = Women who are householder or spouse of householder			

<sup>1</sup> Source: 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, Census 2000

**Table A-5. Comparison of Standard and Alternative Arab Identity Groups, Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County CMSA<sup>1</sup>**

	<u><b>STANDARD DEFINITION</b></u> (1 <sup>st</sup> and/or 2 <sup>nd</sup> ancestry reported)			<u><b>ALTERNATIVE DEFINITION</b></u> (Place of birth and/or Language)			
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>		<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>		<b>P-value</b>
<b>Population</b>	110,663			10,453			
<b>Race</b>							
White alone or with another race	106,984	96.7 %		9,519	91.1 %		P<.0001
Black	874	0.8 %		231	2.2 %		P<.05
Asian	731	0.7 %		199	1.9 %		P=.214
Hawaii/PI/Native Am	110	0.1 %		33	0.3 %		P=.315
Other race alone	1,373	1.2 %		444	4.3 %		P<.01
All other combinations	591	0.5 %		27	0.3 %		P=.592
<b>Educational attainment</b>							
Persons 25 years and over	68,870			7,743			
High school graduate or higher	58,292	84.6 %		5,755	74.3 %		P<.0001
Bachelor's degree or higher	28,193	40.9 %		2,281	29.5 %		P<.0001
Graduate degree or higher	10,266	14.9 %		868	11.2 %		P<.01
<b>Labor force status</b>							
Persons 16 years and over	83,022			9,025			
In civilian labor force	50,621	61.0 % <sup>a</sup>		4,611	51.1 % <sup>a</sup>		P<.0001
Employed (in civilian labor force)	47,148	56.8 % <sup>a</sup>		4,321	47.9 % <sup>a</sup>		P<.001
Unemployed (in civilian labor force)	3,473	6.9 % <sup>b</sup>		290	6.3 % <sup>b</sup>		P=.893
Not in labor force	32,344	39.0 % <sup>a</sup>		4,414	48.9 % <sup>a</sup>		P<.0001
Mean hours worked (hours worked in 1999)		1891.3 <sup>c</sup>			1763.5 <sup>c</sup>		P<.05

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

<b>Poverty rate</b>					
All Persons (in household)		12.1 %		19.0 %	P<.001
<b>Age and sex</b>					
Male	59,072	53.4 %		5,503	52.7 %
Mean age		33.0		39.7	P<.0001

a= Among those 16 years or older

b= Among those 16 years or older and in civilian labor force

c= Among those 16 years or older and employed

<sup>1</sup> Source: 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, Census 2000

**Table A-6. Comparison of Standard and Expanded Arab Definitions, Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County<sup>1</sup>**

	<u>STANDARD DEFINITION</u> (1 <sup>st</sup> and/or 2 <sup>nd</sup> ancestry reported)			<u>EXPANDED DEFINITION</u> (1 <sup>st</sup> and/or 2 <sup>nd</sup> ancestry; Place of birth; Language)		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	
<b>Race</b>	110,663	100.0	%	121,116	100.0	%
White alone or with another race	106,984	96.7	%	116,503	96.2	%
Black	874	0.8	%	1,105	0.9	%
Asian	731	0.7	%	930	0.8	%
Hawaii/PI/Native Am	110	0.1	%	143	0.1	%
Other race alone	1,373	1.2	%	1,817	1.5	%
All other combinations	591	0.5	%	618	0.5	%
<b>Nativity and year of entry</b>						
All persons	110,663	100.0	%	121,116	100.0	%
Native	50,783	45.9	%	52,589	43.4	%
Foreign born	59,880	54.1	%	68,527	56.6	%
Entered before 1990	41,203	68.8	% <sup>a</sup>	46,626	68.0	% <sup>a</sup>
Entered between 1990-2000	18,677	31.2	% <sup>a</sup>	21,901	32.0	% <sup>a</sup>
Citizenship status						
Naturalized citizen	38,351	64.1	% <sup>a</sup>	43,285	63.2	% <sup>a</sup>
Not a citizen	21,529	36.0	% <sup>a</sup>	25,242	36.8	% <sup>a</sup>
<b>Educational attainment</b>						
Persons 25 years and over	68,870			76,613		
High school graduate or higher	58,292	84.6	%	64,047	83.6	%
Bachelor's degree or higher	28,193	40.9	%	30,474	39.8	%
Graduate degree or higher	10,266	14.9	%	11,134	14.5	%
<b>Ability to speak English</b>						
Persons 5 years and over	102,152			112,532		

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

Speak other language at home	70,530	69.0 %	79,308	70.5 %
Do not speak English very well	23,233	22.7 % <sup>b</sup>	27,346	24.3 % <sup>b</sup>
Persons 5 years and over in households	101,241		111,399	
In linguistically isolated households	9,968	9.9 %	11,871	10.7 %
<b>Labor force status</b>				
Persons 16 years and over	83,022		92,047	
In civilian labor force	50,621	61.0 %	55,232	60.0 %
Employed (in civilian labor force)	47,148	56.8 % <sup>c</sup>	51,469	55.9 % <sup>c</sup>
Unemployed (in civilian labor force)	3,473	6.9 % <sup>d</sup>	3,763	6.8 % <sup>d</sup>
Not in labor force	32,344	39.0 % <sup>c</sup>	36,758	39.9 % <sup>c</sup>
Mean hours worked (hours worked in 1999)		1891.3 <sup>e</sup>		1880.6 <sup>e</sup>
<b>Occupation</b>				
Employed persons 16 years and over	47,205	100.0 %	51,526	100.0 %
Management, professional, related occupations	20,452	43.3 %	22,023	42.7 %
Service	4,249	9.0 %	4,965	9.6 %
Sales and office	17,212	36.5 %	18,410	35.7 %
Other	5,276	11.2 %	6,112	11.9 %
Military	16	0.0 %	16	0.0 %
<b>Income in 1999</b>				
Households				
Median income (dollars)	51,500		50,000	
Mean income (dollars)	73,708		71,538	
<b>Poverty rate (all persons in household)</b>		12.1 %		12.7 %
<b>Household size</b>				
Average number of persons in household		3.0		3.0
<b>Marital status</b>				
Persons 15 years and over	84,413	100.0 %	93,577	100.0 %
Now married	48,828	57.8 %	53,928	57.6 %
Widowed/Divorced/Separated	10,977	13.0 %	12,671	13.5 %

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

Never married	24,608	29.2 %	26,978	28.8 %
<b>Number of own children under 18 years old living in household for women age 35-44<sup>f</sup></b>		1.6		1.6
<b>Age and sex</b>				
Male	59,072	53.4 %	64,575	53.3 %
Mean age		33.0		33.5
a= Among foreign born people	d= Among 16 years or older in civilian labor force			
b= Among 5 years or older.	e= Among 16 years or older and employed			
c= Among 16 years or older	f = Women who are householder or spouse of householder			

<sup>1</sup> Source: 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, Census 2000

**Table A-7. Sociodemographic Differences Between Standard and Alternative Arab Identity Groups, Detroit/Ann Arbor/Flint CMSA<sup>1</sup>**

	<u>STANDARD DEFINITION</u> (1 <sup>st</sup> and/or 2 <sup>nd</sup> ancestry reported)			<u>ALTERNATIVE DEFINITION</u> (Place of birth and/or Language)			
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent		P-value
<b>Population</b>	100,507			28,627			
<b>Race</b>							
White alone or with another race	99,273	98.8 %		27,531	96.2 %		P<.001
Black	761	0.8 %		395	1.4 %		P=.103
Asian	102	0.1 %		411	1.4 %		P<.01
Hawaii/PI/Native Am	44	0.0 %		52	0.2 %		P=.694
Other race alone	254	0.3 %		220	0.8 %		P<.1
All other combinations	73	0.1 %		18	0.1 %		P=.902
<b>Educational attainment</b>							
Persons 25 years and over	53,176			19,703			
High school graduate or higher	38,528	72.5 %		9,561	48.5 %		P<.0001
Bachelor's degree or higher	14,689	27.6 %		2,838	14.4 %		P<.0001
Graduate degree or higher	6,321	11.9 %		950	4.8 %		P<.0001
<b>Labor force status</b>							
Persons 16 years and over	66,540			23,628			
In civilian labor force	39,018	58.6 % <sup>a</sup>		13,151	55.7 % <sup>a</sup>		P=.171
Employed (in civilian labor force)	36,772	55.3 % <sup>a</sup>		12,480	52.8 % <sup>a</sup>		P=.283
Unemployed (in civilian labor force)	2,246	5.8 % <sup>b</sup>		671	5.1 % <sup>b</sup>		P=.555
Not in labor force	27,522	41.4 % <sup>a</sup>		10,477	44.3 % <sup>a</sup>		P=.171
Mean hours worked (hours worked in 1999)		1888.6 <sup>c</sup>			1839.5 <sup>c</sup>		P=.158

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

<b>Poverty rate</b>					
All Persons (in household)	19.5 %		5,133	18.0 %	P=.203
<b>Age and sex</b>					
Male	53.0 %		14,819	51.8 %	P=.643
Mean age	28.0			35.7	P<.0001

a= Among those 16 years or older

b= Among those 16 years or older and in civilian labor force

c= Among those 16 years or older and employed

<sup>1</sup> Source: 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, Census 2000

**Table A-8. Sociodemographic Differences Between Standard and Expanded Arab Definitions, Detroit/Ann Arbor/Flint CMSA<sup>1</sup>**

	<u>STANDARD DEFINITION</u> (1 <sup>st</sup> and/or 2 <sup>nd</sup> ancestry reported)			<u>EXPANDED DEFINITION</u> (1 <sup>st</sup> and/or 2 <sup>nd</sup> ancestry; Place of birth; Language)		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	
<b>Race</b>	100,507	100.0	%	129,134	100.0	%
White alone or with another race	99,273	98.8	%	126,804	98.2	%
Black	761	0.8	%	1,156	0.9	%
Asian	102	0.1	%	513	0.4	%
Hawaii/PI/Native Am	44	0.0	%	96	0.1	%
Other race alone	254	0.3	%	474	0.4	%
All other combinations	73	0.1	%	91	0.1	%
<b>Nativity and year of entry</b>						
All persons	100,507	100.0	%	129,134	100.0	%
Native	57,077	56.8	%	61,733	47.8	%
Foreign born	43,430	43.2	%	67,401	52.2	%
Entered before 1990	21,560	49.6	% <sup>a</sup>	33,155	49.2	% <sup>a</sup>
Entered between 1990-2000	21,870	50.4	% <sup>a</sup>	34,246	50.8	% <sup>a</sup>
Citizenship status						
Naturalized citizen	23,182	53.4	% <sup>a</sup>	36,558	54.2	% <sup>a</sup>
Not a citizen	20,248	46.6	% <sup>a</sup>	30,843	45.8	% <sup>a</sup>
<b>Educational attainment</b>						
Persons 25 years and over	53,176			72,879		
High school graduate or higher	38,528	72.5	%	48,089	66.0	%
Bachelor's degree or higher	14,689	27.6	%	17,527	24.1	%
Graduate degree or higher	6,321	11.9	%	7,271	10.0	%
<b>Ability to speak English</b>						
Persons 5 years and over	87,202			115,307		

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

Speak other language at home	56,445	64.7 %	83,354	72.3 %
Do not speak English very well	23,429	26.9 % <sup>b</sup>	38,488	33.4 % <sup>b</sup>
Persons 5 years and over in households	86,741		114,776	
In linguistically isolated households	11,639	13.4 %	19,369	16.9 %
<b>Labor force status</b>				
Persons 16 years and over	66,540		90,168	
In civilian labor force	39,018	58.6 %	52,169	57.9 %
Employed (in civilian labor force)	36,772	55.3 % <sup>c</sup>	49,252	54.6 % <sup>c</sup>
Unemployed (in civilian labor force)	2,246	5.8 % <sup>d</sup>	2,917	5.6 % <sup>d</sup>
Not in labor force	27,522	41.4 % <sup>c</sup>	37,999	42.1 % <sup>c</sup>
Mean hours worked (hours worked in 1999)		1888.6 <sup>e</sup>		1876.1 <sup>e</sup>
<b>Occupation</b>				
Employed persons 16 years and over	36,772	100.0 %	49,252	100.0 %
Management, professional, related occupations	12,286	33.4 %	14,810	30.1 %
Service	5,075	13.8 %	6,647	13.5 %
Sales and office	11,573	31.5 %	16,846	34.2 %
Other	7,838	21.3 %	10,949	22.2 %
Military	-	0.0 %	-	0.0 %
<b>Income in 1999</b>				
Households				
Median income (dollars)	42,000		42,500	
Mean income (dollars)	63,099		62,570	
<b>Poverty rate (all persons in household)</b>		19.5 %		19.2 %
<b>Household size</b>				
Average number of persons in household		3.5		3.6
<b>Marital status</b>				
Persons 15 years and over	67,862	100.0 %	91,954	100.0 %
Now married	41,035	60.5 %	54,640	59.4 %
Widowed/Divorced/Separated	7,823	11.5 %	10,846	11.8 %

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

Never married	19,004	28.0 %	26,468	28.8 %
<b>Number of own children under 18 years old living in household for women age 35-44<sup>f</sup></b>		2.2		2.3
<b>Age and sex</b>				
Male	53,257	53.0 %	68,076	52.7 %
Mean age		28.0		29.7
a= Among foreign born people	d= Among 16 years or older in civilian labor force			
b= Among 5 years or older.	e= Among 16 years or older and employed			
c= Among 16 years or older	f = Women who are householder or spouse of householder			

<sup>1</sup> Source: 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, Census 2000

**Table M-1. Mexican population by Top-15 CMSA/MSA, Standard Census Definition<sup>1</sup>**

	<b>CMSA</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1	Los Angeles, Riverside, Orange County (CMSA)	5,033,233	24.1
2	Chicago, Gary, Kenosha (CMSA)	1,128,594	5.4
3	Houston, Galveston, Brazoria (CMSA)	995,338	4.8
4	San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose (CMSA)	986,424	4.7
5	Dallas, Fort Worth (CMSA)	892,709	4.3
6	Phoenix, Mesa (MSA)	629,969	3.0
7	San Diego (MSA)	627,451	3.0
8	San Antonio (MSA)	575,503	2.8
9	El Paso (MSA)	453,889	2.2
10	McAllen, Edinburg, Mission (MSA)	435,741	2.1
11	Fresno (MSA)	355,661	1.7
12	New York, Northern New Jersey, Long Island (CMSA)	342,037	1.6
13	Denver, Boulder, Greeley (CMSA)	315,513	1.5
14	Austin, San Marcos (MSA)	237,643	1.1
15	Brownsville, Harlingen, San Benito (MSA)	235,017	1.1
	Sub-total	13,244,722	63.5
	Not in a metropolitan area	1,866,613	8.9
	Total Mexican population (standard)	20,867,722	

<sup>1</sup> Source: 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, Census 2000

**Table M-2. Mexican population by Top-15 CMSA/MSA, Expanded<sup>1</sup> Definition<sup>2</sup>**

	<b>CMSA</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1	Los Angeles, Riverside, Orange County (CMSA)	5,427,908	23.7
2	Chicago, Gary, Kenosha (CMSA)	1,188,833	5.2
3	Houston, Galveston, Brazoria (CMSA)	1,093,046	4.8
4	San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose (CMSA)	1,064,495	4.7
5	Dallas, Fort Worth (CMSA)	970,062	4.2
6	San Antonio (MSA)	684,739	3.0
7	Phoenix, Mesa (MSA)	683,996	3.0
8	San Diego (MSA)	675,691	3.0
9	El Paso (MSA)	501,992	2.2
10	McAllen, Edinburg, Mission (MSA)	476,121	2.1
11	Fresno (MSA)	385,280	1.7
12	New York, Northern New Jersey, Long Island (CMSA)	366,492	1.6
13	Denver, Boulder, Greeley (CMSA)	353,776	1.5
14	Brownsville, Harlingen, San Benito (MSA)	267,345	1.2
15	Austin, San Marcos (MSA)	266,199	1.2
	Sub-total	14,405,975	62.9
	Not in a metropolitan area	2,108,783	9.2
	Total Mexican population (expanded)	22,906,341	

<sup>1</sup> Expanded definition includes Standard Census Definition plus Mexican ancestry and/or place of birth

<sup>2</sup> Source: 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, Census 2000

**Table M-3. Sociodemographic Differences Between Standard and Alternative Mexican Identity Groups, Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County CMSA<sup>1</sup>**

	<b>STANDARD DEFINITION</b> (Hispanic origin Mexican)		<b>ALTERNATIVE DEFINITION</b> (Place of birth and/or Mexican ancestry 1 <sup>st</sup> and/or 2 <sup>nd</sup> )		
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>P-value</b>
<b>Population</b>	5,033,233		394,675		
<b>Race</b>					
White alone or with another race	2,282,366	45.4 %	188,966	47.9 %	P<.0001
Black	28,113	0.6 %	7,267	1.8 %	P<.0001
Asian	19,453	0.4 %	4,690	1.2 %	P<.0001
Hawaii/PI/Native Am	66,247	1.3 %	8,539	2.2 %	P<.0001
Other race alone	2,628,979	52.2 %	182,997	46.4 %	P<.0001
All other combinations	8,075	0.2 %	2,216	0.6 %	P<.0001
<b>Educational attainment</b>					
Persons 25 years and over	2,456,956		191,289		
High school graduate or higher	1,033,660	42.1 %	81,332	42.5 %	P<.1
Bachelor's degree or higher	143,992	5.9 %	11,374	6.0 %	P=.822
Graduate degree or higher	45,845	1.9 %	3,301	1.7 %	P=.283
<b>Labor force status</b>					
Persons 16 years and over	3,283,290		251,914		
In civilian labor force	1,956,916	59.6 % <sup>a</sup>	132,750	52.7 % <sup>a</sup>	P<.0001
Employed (in civilian labor force)	1,775,052	54.1 % <sup>a</sup>	117,398	46.6 % <sup>a</sup>	P<.0001
Unemployed (in civilian labor force)	181,864	9.3 % <sup>b</sup>	15,352	11.6 % <sup>b</sup>	P<.0001
Not in labor force	1,323,017	40.3 % <sup>a</sup>	118,754	47.1 % <sup>a</sup>	P<.0001
Mean hours worked (hours worked in 1999)		1698.7 <sup>c</sup>		1644.9 <sup>c</sup>	P<.0001

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

<b>Poverty rate</b> All Persons (in household)		22.6 %		23.8 %	P<.0001	
<b>Age and sex</b> Male	2,576,736	51.2 %		195,495	49.5 %	P<.0001
Mean age		26.0		25.5	P<.0001	
<b>Hispanic origin groups</b>		N %		N %		
	Mexican	5,033,233 100.0		Other Spanish or Latino Not Hispanic or Latino	295,927 75.0 98,748 25.0	

a= Among those 16 years or older

b= Among those 16 years or older and in civilian labor force

c= Among those 16 years or older and  
employed

<sup>1</sup> Source: 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, Census 2000

**Table M-4. Sociodemographic Differences Between Standard and Expanded Mexican Definitions, Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County CMSA<sup>1</sup>**

	<u>STANDARD DEFINITION</u>		<u>EXPANDED DEFINITION</u>	
	(Hispanic origin Mexican)		(1 <sup>st</sup> and/or 2 <sup>nd</sup> ancestry; Place of birth; Hispanic origin)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>Race</b>	5,033,233	100.0 %	5,427,908	100.0 %
White alone or with another race	2,282,366	45.4 %	2,471,332	45.5 %
Black	28,113	0.6 %	35,380	0.7 %
Asian	19,453	0.4 %	24,143	0.4 %
Hawaii/PI/Native Am	66,247	1.3 %	74,786	1.4 %
Other race alone	2,628,979	52.2 %	2,811,976	51.8 %
All other combinations	8,075	0.2 %	10,291	0.2 %
<b>Nativity and year of entry</b>				
All persons	5,033,233	100.0 %	5,427,908	100.0 %
Native	2,788,118	55.4 %	3,008,852	55.4 %
Foreign born	2,245,115	44.6 %	2,419,056	44.6 %
Entered before 1990	1,402,208	62.5 % <sup>a</sup>	1,513,241	62.6 % <sup>a</sup>
Entered between 1990-2000	842,907	37.5 % <sup>a</sup>	905,815	37.4 % <sup>a</sup>
Citizenship status				
Naturalized citizen	543,230	24.2 % <sup>a</sup>	586,698	24.3 % <sup>a</sup>
Not a citizen	1,701,885	75.8 % <sup>a</sup>	1,832,358	75.8 % <sup>a</sup>
<b>Educational attainment</b>				
Persons 25 years and over	2,456,956		2,648,245	
High school graduate or higher	1,033,660	42.1 %	1,114,992	42.1 %
Bachelor's degree or higher	143,992	5.9 %	155,366	5.9 %
Graduate degree or higher	45,845	1.9 %	49,146	1.9 %
<b>Ability to speak English</b>				
Persons 5 years and over	4,461,364		4,811,799	

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

Speak other language at home	3,610,504	80.9 %	3,862,699	80.3 %
Do not speak English very well	2,012,524	45.1 % <sup>b</sup>	2,159,063	44.9 % <sup>b</sup>
Persons 5 years and over in households	4,414,835		4,760,897	
In linguistically isolated households	1,104,712	25.0 %	1,184,405	24.9 %
<b>Labor force status</b>				
Persons 16 years and over	3,283,290		3,535,204	
In civilian labor force	1,956,916	59.6 %	2,089,666	59.1 %
Employed (in civilian labor force)	1,775,052	54.1 % <sup>c</sup>	1,892,450	53.5 % <sup>c</sup>
Unemployed (in civilian labor force)	181,864	9.3 % <sup>d</sup>	197,216	9.4 % <sup>d</sup>
Not in labor force	1,323,017	40.3 % <sup>c</sup>	1,441,771	40.8 % <sup>c</sup>
Mean hours worked (hours worked in 1999)		1698.7 <sup>e</sup>		1695.3 <sup>e</sup>
<b>Occupation</b>				
Employed persons 16 years and over	1,778,409	100.0 %	1,896,217	100.0 %
Management, professional, related occupations	259,089	14.6 %	279,041	14.7 %
Service	367,397	20.7 %	390,944	20.6 %
Sales and office	422,270	23.7 %	454,028	23.9 %
Other	728,069	41.0 %	770,455	40.6 %
Military	1,584	0.1 %	1,749	0.1 %
<b>Income in 1999</b>				
Households				
Median income (dollars)	36,500		36,200	
Mean income (dollars)	46,365		46,357	
<b>Poverty rate (all persons in household)</b>		22.6 %		22.7 %
<b>Household size</b>				
Average number of persons in household		4.3		4.3
<b>Marital status</b>				
Persons 15 years and over	3,367,350	100.0 %	3,626,082	%
Now married	1,752,787	52.1 %	1,884,851	52.0 %
Widowed/Divorced/Separated	392,497	11.7 %	426,080	11.8 %

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

Never married	1,222,066	36.3 %	1,315,151	36.3 %
<b>Number of own children under 18 years old living in household for women age 35-44<sup>f</sup></b>		2.1		2.1
<b>Age and sex</b>				
Male	2,576,736	51.2 %	2,772,231	51.1 %
Mean age		26.0		25.9
<b>Hispanic origin groups</b>		N %	N %	
	Mexican	5,033,233 100.0	Mexican	5,033,233 92.7
			Other Spanish or Latino	295,927 5.5
			Not Hispanic or Latino	98,748 1.8
a= Among foreign born people	d= Among 16 years or older in civilian labor force			
b= Among 5 years or older.	e= Among 16 years or older and employed			
c= Among 16 years or older	f = Women who are householder or spouse of householder			

<sup>1</sup> Source: 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, Census 2000

**Table M-5. Sociodemographic Differences Between Standard and Alternative Mexican Identity Groups, Chicago/Gary/Kenosha CMSA<sup>1</sup>**

	<b>STANDARD DEFINITION</b> (Hispanic origin Mexican)			<b>ALTERNATIVE DEFINITION</b> (Place of birth and/or Mexican ancestry 1 <sup>st</sup> and/or 2 <sup>nd</sup> )			
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>		<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>		<b>P-value</b>
<b>Population</b>	1,128,594			60,239			
<b>Race</b>							
White alone or with another race	564,435	50.0	%	33,380	55.4	%	P<.0001
Black	9,400	0.8	%	1,992	3.3	%	P<.0001
Asian	2,527	0.2	%	559	0.9	%	P<.001
Hawaii/PI/Native Am	10,024	0.9	%	717	1.2	%	P=.189
Other race alone	541,093	47.9	%	23,390	38.8	%	P<.0001
All other combinations	1,115	0.1	%	201	0.3	%	P=.196
<b>Educational attainment</b>							
Persons 25 years and over	542,144			24,278			
High school graduate or higher	235,563	43.5	%	13,845	57.0	%	P<.0001
Bachelor's degree or higher	34,106	6.3	%	2,633	10.9	%	P<.0001
Graduate degree or higher	10,928	2.0	%	864	3.6	%	P<.05
<b>Labor force status</b>							
Persons 16 years and over	752,781			35,547			
In civilian labor force	481,118	63.9	% <sup>a</sup>	21,947	61.7	% <sup>a</sup>	P<.05
Employed (in civilian labor force)	440,984	58.6	% <sup>a</sup>	19,712	55.5	% <sup>a</sup>	P<.05
Unemployed (in civilian labor force)	40,134	8.3	% <sup>b</sup>	2,235	10.2	% <sup>b</sup>	P=.225
Not in labor force	270,851	36.0	% <sup>a</sup>	13,514	38.0	% <sup>a</sup>	P<.1
Mean hours worked (hours worked in 1999)		1,758.5	<sup>c</sup>		1631.4	<sup>c</sup>	P<.001

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

<b>Poverty rate</b> All Persons (in household)		16.0 %		15.7 %	P=.446
<b>Age and sex</b> Male	601,416	53.3 %		31,059	51.6 % P=.212
Mean age		25.2		22.5	P<.0001
<b>Hispanic origin groups</b>		N %		N %	
	Mexican	1,128,594 100.0		Other Spanish or Latino Not Hispanic or Latino	41,307 68.6 18,932 31.4

a= Among those 16 years or older

b= Among those 16 years or older and in civilian labor force

c= Among those 16 years or older and employed

<sup>1</sup> Source: 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, Census 2000

**Table M-6. Sociodemographic Differences Between Standard and Expanded Mexican Definitions, Chicago/Gary/Kenosha CMSA<sup>1</sup>**

	<b>STANDARD DEFINITION</b> (Hispanic origin Mexican)			<b>EXPANDED DEFINITION</b> (1 <sup>st</sup> and/or 2 <sup>nd</sup> ancestry; Place of birth; Hispanic origin)		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	
<b>Race</b>	1,128,594	100.0 %		1,188,833	100.0 %	
White alone or with another race	564,435	50.0 %		597,815	50.3 %	
Black	9,400	0.8 %		11,392	1.0 %	
Asian	2,527	0.2 %		3,086	0.3 %	
Hawaii/PI/Native Am	10,024	0.9 %		10,741	0.9 %	
Other race alone	541,093	47.9 %		564,483	47.5 %	
All other combinations	1,115	0.1 %		1,316	0.1 %	
<b>Nativity and year of entry</b>						
All persons	1,128,594	100.0 %		1,188,833	100.0 %	
Native	548,191	48.6 %		589,848	49.6 %	
Foreign born	580,403	51.4 %		598,985	50.4 %	
Entered before 1990	298,499	51.4 % <sup>a</sup>		307,506	51.3 % <sup>a</sup>	
Entered between 1990-2000	281,904	48.6 % <sup>a</sup>		291,479	48.7 % <sup>a</sup>	
Citizenship status						
Naturalized citizen	141,235	24.3 % <sup>a</sup>		146,301	24.4 % <sup>a</sup>	
Not a citizen	439,168	75.7 % <sup>a</sup>		452,684	75.6 % <sup>a</sup>	
<b>Educational attainment</b>						
Persons 25 years and over	542,144			566,422		
High school graduate or higher	235,563	43.5 %		249,408	44.0 %	
Bachelor's degree or higher	34,106	6.3 %		36,739	6.5 %	
Graduate degree or higher	10,928	2.0 %		11,792	2.1 %	
<b>Ability to speak English</b>						
Persons 5 years and over	993,881			1,045,344		

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

Speak other language at home	855,100	86.0 %	888,498	85.0 %
Do not speak English very well	510,141	51.3 % <sup>b</sup>	526,970	50.4 % <sup>b</sup>
Persons 5 years and over in households	988,172		1,038,965	
In linguistically isolated households	318,753	32.3 %	327,487	31.5 %
<b>Labor force status</b>				
Persons 16 years and over	752,781		788,328	
In civilian labor force	481,118	63.9 %	503,065	63.8 %
Employed (in civilian labor force)	440,984	58.6 % <sup>c</sup>	460,696	58.4 % <sup>c</sup>
Unemployed (in civilian labor force)	40,134	8.3 % <sup>d</sup>	42,369	8.4 % <sup>d</sup>
Not in labor force	270,851	36.0 % <sup>c</sup>	284,365	36.1 % <sup>c</sup>
Mean hours worked (hours worked in 1999)		1758.5 <sup>e</sup>		1,753.1 <sup>e</sup>
<b>Occupation</b>				
Employed persons 16 years and over	441,796	100.0 %	461,594	100.0 %
Management, professional, related occupations	49,779	11.3 %	53,281	11.5 %
Service	93,612	21.2 %	97,229	21.1 %
Sales and office	89,245	20.2 %	95,065	20.6 %
Other	208,598	47.2 %	215,422	46.7 %
Military	562	0.1 %	597	0.1 %
<b>Income in 1999</b>				
Households				
Median income (dollars)	41,600		41,700	
Mean income (dollars)	50,160		50,347	
<b>Poverty rate (all persons in household)</b>		16.0 %		16.0 %
<b>Household size</b>				
Average number of persons in household		4.2		4.2
<b>Marital status</b>				
Persons 15 years and over	771,309	100.0 %	807,969	100.0 %
Now married	425,459	55.2 %	443,822	54.9 %
Widowed/Divorced/Separated	69,402	9.0 %	72,958	9.0 %

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

Never married	276,448	35.8 %	291,189	36.0 %
<b>Number of own children under 18 years old living in household for women age 35-44<sup>f</sup></b>	2.1		2.1	
<b>Age and sex</b>				
Male	601,416	53.3 %	632,475	53.2 %
Mean age	25.2		25.1	
<b>Hispanic origin groups</b>				
		N %	N %	
	Mexican	1,128,594 100.0	Mexican	1,128,594 94.9
			Other Spanish or Latino	41,307 3.5
			Not Hispanic or Latino	18,932 1.6
a= Among foreign born people	d= Among 16 years or older in civilian labor force			
b= Among 5 years or older.	e= Among 16 years or older and employed			
c= Among 16 years or older	f = Women who are householder or spouse of householder			

<sup>1</sup> Source: 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, Census 2000

**Table M-7. Sociodemographic Differences Between Standard and Alternative Mexican Identity Groups, Houston/Galveston/Brazoria<sup>1</sup>**

	<u><b>STANDARD DEFINITION</b></u> (Hispanic origin Mexican)			<u><b>ALTERNATIVE DEFINITION</b></u> (Place of birth and/or Mexican ancestry 1 <sup>st</sup> and/or 2 <sup>nd</sup> )			<b>P-value</b>
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>		<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>		
<b>Population</b>	995,338			97,708			
<b>Race</b>							
White alone or with another race	561,184	56.4	%	52,650	53.9	%	P<.001
Black	6,286	0.6	%	2,367	2.4	%	P<.0001
Asian	1,731	0.2	%	409	0.4	%	P<.01
Hawaii/PI/Native Am	6,752	0.7	%	1,950	2.0	%	P<.0001
Other race alone	418,207	42.0	%	40,092	41.0	%	P=.362
All other combinations	1,178	0.1	%	240	0.3	%	P<.05
<b>Educational attainment</b>							
Persons 25 years and over	489,116			46,425			
High school graduate or higher	206,281	42.2	%	23,126	49.8	%	P<.0001
Bachelor's degree or higher	32,303	6.6	%	3,468	7.5	%	P<.1
Graduate degree or higher	10,585	2.2	%	906	2.0	%	P=.810
<b>Labor force status</b>							
Persons 16 years and over	667,387			62,834			
In civilian labor force	401,078	60.1	% <sup>a</sup>	38,244	60.9	% <sup>a</sup>	P=.637
Employed (in civilian labor force)	368,930	55.3	% <sup>a</sup>	34,467	54.9	% <sup>a</sup>	P=.516
Unemployed (in civilian labor force)	32,148	8.0	% <sup>b</sup>	3,777	9.9	% <sup>b</sup>	P<.05
Not in labor force	265,945	39.9	% <sup>a</sup>	24,569	39.1	% <sup>a</sup>	P=.648
Mean hours worked (hours worked in 1999)		1784.0	<sup>c</sup>		1740.2	<sup>c</sup>	P=.277

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

<b>Poverty rate</b> All Persons (in household)	22.0 %	19,412	20.0 %	P<.01	
<b>Age and sex</b> Male	524,118	52.7 %	48,998	50.2 %	P<.01
Mean age	25.8		25.3	P=.148	
<b>Hispanic origin groups</b>					
Mexican	N 995,338	% 100.0	Other Spanish or Latino 77,427	N 79.2	% 20.8
			Not Hispanic or Latino	20,281	

a= Among those 16 years or older

b= Among those 16 years or older and in civilian labor force

c= Among those 16 years or older and  
employed

<sup>1</sup> Source: 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, Census 2000

**Table M-8. Sociodemographic Differences Between Standard and Expanded Mexican Definitions, Houston/Galveston/Brazoria<sup>1</sup>**

	<u>STANDARD DEFINITION</u> (Hispanic origin Mexican)		<u>EXPANDED DEFINITION</u> (1 <sup>st</sup> and/or 2 <sup>nd</sup> ancestry; Place of birth; Hispanic origin)		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
<b>Race</b>	995,338	100.0 %	1,093,046	100.0	%
White alone or with another race	561,184	56.4 %	613,834	56.2	%
Black	6,286	0.6 %	8,653	0.8	%
Asian	1,731	0.2 %	2,140	0.2	%
Hawaii/PI/Native Am	6,752	0.7 %	8,702	0.8	%
Other race alone	418,207	42.0 %	458,299	41.9	%
All other combinations	1,178	0.1 %	1,418	0.1	%
<b>Nativity and year of entry</b>					
All persons	995,338	100.0 %	1,093,046	100.0	%
Native	569,119	57.2 %	636,076	58.2	%
Foreign born	426,219	42.8 %	456,970	41.8	%
Entered before 1990	208,373	48.9 % <sup>a</sup>	224,268	49.1	% <sup>a</sup>
Entered between 1990-2000	217,846	51.1 % <sup>a</sup>	232,702	50.9	% <sup>a</sup>
Citizenship status					

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

Naturalized citizen	91,152	21.4 % <sup>a</sup>	99,327	21.7	% <sup>a</sup>
Not a citizen	335,067	78.6 % <sup>a</sup>	357,643	78.3	% <sup>a</sup>
<b>Educational attainment</b>					
Persons 25 years and over	489,116		535,541		
High school graduate or higher	206,281	42.2 %	229,407	42.8	%
Bachelor's degree or higher	32,303	6.6 %	35,771	6.7	%
Graduate degree or higher	10,585	2.2 %	11,491	2.2	%
<b>Ability to speak English</b>					
Persons 5 years and over	878,587		965,046		
Speak other language at home	729,620	83.0 %	790,442	81.9	%
Do not speak English very well	388,264	44.2 % <sup>b</sup>	416,396	43.1	% <sup>b</sup>
Persons 5 years and over in households	868,458		954,424		
In linguistically isolated households	243,584	28.1 %	259,657	27.2	%
<b>Labor force status</b>					
Persons 16 years and over	667,387		730,221		
In civilian labor force	401,078	60.1 %	439,322	60.2	%
Employed (in civilian labor force)	368,930	55.3 % <sup>c</sup>	403,397	55.2	% <sup>c</sup>
Unemployed (in civilian labor force)	32,148	8.0 % <sup>d</sup>	35,925	8.2	% <sup>d</sup>
Not in labor force	265,945	39.9 % <sup>c</sup>	290,514	39.8	% <sup>c</sup>

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

Mean hours worked (hours worked in 1999)		1784.0 <sup>e</sup>		1,780.2 <sup>e</sup>	
<b>Occupation</b>					
Employed persons 16 years and over	369,294	100.0 %		403,782	100.0 %
Management, professional, related occupations	51,827	14.0 %		58,034	14.4 %
Service	78,086	21.1 %		84,353	20.9 %
Sales and office	81,903	22.2 %		91,599	22.7 %
Other	157,372	42.6 %		169,669	42.0 %
Military	106	0.0 %		127	0.0 %
<b>Income in 1999</b>					
Households					
Median income (dollars)	32,800			33,000	
Mean income (dollars)	41,647			41,973	
<b>Poverty rate (all persons in household)</b>		22.0 %		21.9 %	
<b>Household size</b>					
Average number of persons in household		3.8		3.8	
<b>Marital status</b>					
Persons 15 years and over	683,496	100.0 %		748,237	%
Now married	393,526	57.6 %		430,808	57.6 %
Widowed/Divorced/Separated	80,195	11.7 %		88,578	11.8 %

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

Never married	209,775	30.7 %	228,851	30.6 %
<b>Number of own children under 18 years old living in household for women age 35-44<sup>f</sup></b>		2.0		2.0
<b>Age and sex</b>				
Male	524,118	52.7 %	573,116	52.4 %
Mean age		25.8		25.8
<b>Hispanic origin groups</b>		N %		N %
	Mexican	995,338 100.0	Mexican	995,338 91.1
			Other Spanish or Latino	77,427 7.1
			Not Hispanic or Latino	20,281 1.9
a= Among foreign born people	d= Among 16 years or older in civilian labor force			
b= Among 5 years or older.	e= Among 16 years or older and employed			
c= Among 16 years or older	f = Women who are householder or spouse of householder			

<sup>1</sup> Source: 5% Public Use Microdata Samples, Census 2000

**Appendix A. Arab Identity Categories, Census 2000**

<u>ANCESTRY</u>		<u>PLACE OF BIRTH</u>		<u>LANGUAGE</u>	
<u>Code</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Category</u>
471	Aden	400	Algeria	777	Arabic
400	Algerian	201	Bahrain		
412	Alhucemas	414	Egypt		
495	Arab	213	Iraq		
496	Arabic	216	Jordan		
415	Bahraini	222	Kuwait		
441	Bedouin	224	Lebanon		
413	Berber	430	Libya		
402	Egyptian	436	Morocco		
466	Gaza Strip	230	Oman		
407	Ifni	234	Qatar		
417	Iraqi	235	Saudi Arabia		
421	Jordanian	239	Syria		
442	Kurdish	456	Tunisia		
444	Kuria Muria Islander	245	United Arab Emirates		
423	Kuwaiti	248	Yemen		
425	Lebanese				
404	Libyan				
490	Mideast				
406	Moroccan				
437	Muscat				
411	North African				
436	Omani				
465	Palestinian				
439	Qatar				

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

414	Rio De Oro
427	Saudi Arabian
470	South Yemeni
429	Syrian
422	Transjordan
438	Trucial States
408	Tunisian
480	United Arab Emirates
467	West Bank
435	Yemeni

---

**Appendix B. Ancestry Responses for Persons Born in an Arab country and/or Speak Arabic but did not list an Arab Ancestry**

Highlighted in yellow are EXCLUDED

<b>Ancestry First Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Ancestry Second Response</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
NOT REPORTED	69,568	23.9	NOT REPORTED	273980	93.93
ARMENIAN	35,066	12.0	GERMAN	2651	0.91
NOT USED (in residual & no response category) <sup>1</sup>	23,429	8.0	IRISH	2022	0.69
CHALDEAN	22,696	7.8	ENGLISH	1833	0.63
ASSYRIAN	14,354	4.9	FRENCH	1496	0.51
AFRICAN AMERICAN	13,278	4.6	ITALIAN	913	0.31
AFRICAN	8,582	2.9	NOT USED/R	617	0.21
OTHER RESPONSES	8,329	2.9	SCOTTISH	578	0.2
SUDANESE	7,835	2.7	SCOTCH IRISH	450	0.15
ASIAN INDIAN	6,479	2.2	POLISH	439	0.15
AMERICAN	6,464	2.2	INDIAN	386	0.13
MALTESE	6,389	2.2	DUTCH	347	0.12
FRENCH	6,303	2.2	AMERICAN INDIAN	326	0.11
GERMAN	4,710	1.6	NORWEGIAN	289	0.1
ISRAELI	4,528	1.6	SWISS	272	0.09
ENGLISH	3,787	1.3	ARMENIAN	255	0.09
IRISH	3,786	1.3	SPANISH	226	0.08
ITALIAN	3,731	1.3	RUSSIAN	223	0.08
PAKISTANI	3,263	1.1	GREEK	210	0.07
UNCODABLE ENTRIES	2,520	0.9	ASIAN INDIAN	200	0.07
GREEK	2,419	0.8	PORTUGUESE	179	0.06
ASIAN	2,401	0.8	ASSYRIAN	177	0.06
IRANIAN	1,827	0.6	CHEROKEE	174	0.06
WHITE	1,780	0.6	SWEDISH	165	0.06
FILIPINO	1,517	0.5	EUROPEAN	161	0.06
TURKISH	1,149	0.4	AFRICAN	146	0.05

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

SPANISH	1,096	0.4	DANISH	146	0.05
SCOTTISH	1,063	0.4	CZECH	142	0.05
BLACK	1,022	0.4	WELSH	138	0.05
ETHIOPIAN	1,012	0.4	TURKISH	135	0.05
POLISH	1,008	0.4	BRITISH	131	0.05
SCOTCH IRISH	954	0.3	PAKISTANI	130	0.04
EUROPEAN	905	0.3	FRENCH CANADIAN	130	0.04
BRITISH	898	0.3	AUSTRIAN	130	0.04
SOMALIAN	867	0.3	MALTESE	128	0.04
RUSSIAN	796	0.3	FILIPINO	127	0.04
AMERICAN INDIAN	726	0.3	AFRICAN AMERICAN	125	0.04
SWEDISH	723	0.3	NATIVE AMERICAN	110	0.04
DUTCH	683	0.2	HUNGARIAN	109	0.04
NORWEGIAN	602	0.2	SCANDINAVIAN	93	0.03
MEXICAN	554	0.2	IRANIAN	79	0.03
UNITED STATES	402	0.1	CANADIAN	57	0.02
CANADIAN	401	0.1	UKRAINIAN	54	0.02
FRENCH CANADIAN	386	0.1	ROMANIAN	54	0.02
CHINESE	364	0.1	SLOVAK	53	0.02
ERITREAN	337	0.1	DUTCH WEST INDIES	52	0.02
JAMAICAN	315	0.1	CHINESE	51	0.02
ALBANIAN	312	0.1	CZECHOSLOVAKIAN	47	0.02
NATIVE AMERICAN	306	0.1	FINNISH	45	0.02
PUERTO RICAN	265	0.1	AFRO	44	0.02
NORTH CAUCASIAN TURKIC	261	0.1	ASIAN	43	0.01
BANGLADESHI	250	0.1	HISPANIC	42	0.01
WELSH	248	0.1	PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN	39	0.01
DANISH	243	0.1	LITHUANIAN	37	0.01
NIGERIAN	237	0.1	PUERTO RICAN	36	0.01
CZECH	218	0.1	ISRAELI	32	0.01
UKRAINIAN	218	0.1	PUNJAB	32	0.01
GUYANESE	208	0.1	SPANIARD	32	0.01

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

PORTUGUESE	202	0.1	BELGIAN	31	0.01
ROMANIAN	202	0.1	MEXICAN	27	0.01
AUSTRIAN	201	0.1	SUDANESE	25	0.01
AFGHAN	195	0.1	THAI	20	0.01
PACIFIC ISLANDER	188	0.1	HERZEGOVINIAN	19	0.01
ANGLO	185	0.1	ECUADORIAN	18	0.01
CZECHOSLOVAKIAN	184	0.1	SICILIAN	18	0.01
BELGIAN	184	0.1	BOHEMIAN	17	0.01
HUNGARIAN	175	0.1	ESTONIAN	17	0.01
SYRIAC	159	0.1	CUBAN	17	0.01
VIETNAMESE	158	0.1	JAMAICAN	16	0.01
SPANIARD	157	0.1	LUXEMBURGER	16	0.01
CHEROKEE	152	0.1	TAIWANESE	16	0.01
BRAZILIAN	149	0.1	CHALDEAN	15	0.01
JAPANESE	148	0.1	ICELANDER	15	0.01
PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN	147	0.1	HAWAIIAN	14	0
HISPANIC	147	0.1	TRINIDADIAN	13	0
SERBIAN	146	0.1	BRITISH ISLES	12	0
SWISS	145	0.1	NIGERIAN	12	0
AUSTRALIAN	141	0.1	CENTRAL AMERICAN INDIAN	10	0
KOREAN	139	0.1			
CAMBODIAN	131	0.0			
HAITIAN	127	0.0			
BULGARIAN	126	0.0			
INDIAN	120	0.0			
SCANDINAVIAN	120	0.0			
THAI	114	0.0			
EAST INDIAN	111	0.0			
HERZEGOVINIAN	107	0.0			
MALAYSIAN	104	0.0			
MIXTURE	102	0.0			
BENGALI	100	0.0			

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

MEXICAN AMERICAN	99	0.0
YUGOSLAVIAN	94	0.0
EASTERN AFRICAN	89	0.0
POLYNESIAN	89	0.0
ECUADORIAN	86	0.0
SRI LANKAN	76	0.0
DOMINICAN	69	0.0
CROATIAN	65	0.0
LITHUANIAN	62	0.0
WEST INDIAN	62	0.0
TRINIDADIAN	59	0.0
SLOVAK	59	0.0
TATAR	57	0.0
SOUTH AFRICAN	57	0.0
ESTONIAN	57	0.0
DUTCH WEST INDIES	56	0.0
LATIN AMERICAN	56	0.0
INDONESIAN	53	0.0
LIBERIAN	53	0.0
NEGRO	52	0.0
COLOMBIAN	52	0.0
VENEZUELAN	51	0.0
MACEDONIAN	51	0.0
GHANIAN	51	0.0
PANAMANIAN	50	0.0
ACADIAN	50	0.0
ICELANDER	49	0.0
CELTIC	47	0.0
EASTERN EUROPEAN	47	0.0
CUBAN	44	0.0
LATVIAN	43	0.0
ARGENTINEAN	41	0.0

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

WESTERN EUROPEAN	40	0.0
SLAVIC	38	0.0
MORDOVIAN	37	0.0
ARUBA ISLANDER	35	0.0
FINNISH	34	0.0
MEXICAN STATE	29	0.0
HAWAIIAN	28	0.0
NORTHERN EUROPEAN	27	0.0
EURASIAN	26	0.0
NORTH AMERICAN	26	0.0
SALVADORAN	26	0.0
SPANISH AMERICAN	25	0.0
CAJUN	25	0.0
SAMOAN	24	0.0
CHILEAN	24	0.0
DINKA	24	0.0
AFRO	22	0.0
SICILIAN	22	0.0
CENTRAL AFRICAN	21	0.0
BURMESE	20	0.0
KENYAN	20	0.0
NEW ZEALANDER	19	0.0
GUATEMALAN	18	0.0
GOANESE	18	0.0
ALEUT	17	0.0
CENTRAL AMERICAN	17	0.0
VINCENT-GRENADINE ISLANDER	17	0.0
BRITISH ISLES	16	0.0
OKINAWAN	16	0.0
TONGAN	16	0.0
TURKESTANI	16	0.0
TEXAS	15	0.0

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

MEXICANO	14	-
NOVA SCOTIA	14	-
BASQUE	13	-
SOUTH AMERICAN	13	-
GRENADIAN	12	-
SIERRA LEONEAN	12	-
BELORUSSIAN	12	-
BARBADIAN	12	-
LUXEMBURGER	11	-
VOLGA	10	-
CAPE VERDEAN	10	-
MEXICAN AMERICAN INDIAN	10	-
LAOTIAN	4	-

1. 'Not Used ' is not supposed to have any respondents. Coding error in original census?

**Appendix C. Mexican Identity Categories, Census 2000**

<b>Code</b>	<b><u>HISPANIC ORIGIN</u></b> <b>Category</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b><u>ANCESTRY</u></b> <b>Category</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b><u>PLACE OF BIRTH</u></b> <b>Category</b>
2	Mexican	210	Mexican	303	Mexico
		211	Mexican American		
		212	Mexicano		
		213	Chicano		
		214	La Raza		
			Mexican American		
		215	Indian		
		218	Mexican State		

**APPENDIX D. Hispanic Origin of Persons Born in Mexico and/or Mexican Ancestry 1,2 but Did not respond "Mexican" on Hispanic Origin**  
 Highlighted in yellow are EXCLUDED

Hispanic Origin	N	Percent
Other Spanish or Latino	1,480,442	69.8
Not Hispanic or Latino	560,187	26.4
Puerto Rican	28,296	1.3
Salvadoran	11,993	0.6
Guatemalan	8,855	0.4
Cuban	7,021	0.3
Spaniard	5,448	0.3
Honduran	3,203	0.2
Nicaraguan	2,374	0.1
Colombian	2,211	0.1
Dominican	2,074	0.1
Ecuadorian	1,993	0.1
Other Central American	1,864	0.1
Peruvian	1,853	0.1
Costa Rican	924	0.0
Venezuelan	661	0.0
Argentinean	525	0.0
Panamanian	491	0.0
Chilean	462	0.0
Other South American	410	0.0
Bolivian	138	0.0
Uruguayan	47	-

**Appendix E. Socio-demographic Differences Between Standard and Expanded Definitions of Arab Population**

	<b><u>STANDARD DEFINITION</u></b> (Ancestry 1 and/or 2)		<b><u>EXPANDED DEFINITION</u></b> (Ancestry 1,2; POB; Language)	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Race</b>	1,172,666	100.0 %	1,464,336	100.0 %
White alone		81.0 %		77.8 %
White and another race		15.6 %		15.0 %
Black alone		1.4 %		3.8 %
Asian alone		0.6 %		1.5 %
Hawaii/PI/Native Am alone		0.1 %		0.2 %
Other race alone		1.0 %		1.2 %
All other combinations		0.4 %		0.6 %
<b>Nativity and Year of Entry</b>				
<b>All persons</b>	1,172,666	100.0 %	1,464,336	100.0 %
Native		60.1 %		54.0 %
Foreign born		39.9 %		46.0 %
Entered before 1990		56.2 % <sup>a</sup>		56.1 % <sup>a</sup>
Entered between 1990-2000		43.9 % <sup>a</sup>		43.9 % <sup>a</sup>
Naturalized citizen		54.5 % <sup>a</sup>		53.8 % <sup>a</sup>
Not a citizen		45.5 % <sup>a</sup>		46.2 % <sup>a</sup>
<b>Educational Attainment</b>				
Persons 25 years and over	698,154		908,640	
High school graduate or higher		86.2 %		83.6 %
Bachelor's degree or higher		41.8 %		39.0 %
Graduate degree or higher		17.2 %		16.0 %
<b>Ability to Speak English</b>				
Persons 5 years and over	1,064,654		1,352,347	

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

Speak other language at home		54.0 %		61.2 %
Do not speak English very well		18.4 % <sup>b</sup>		21.5 % <sup>b</sup>
Persons 5 years and over in households	1,047,350		1,325,238	
In linguistically isolated households		9.0 %		10.5 %
<b>Labor Force Status</b>				
Persons 16 years and over	850,592		1,098,307	
In civilian labor force		64.9 %		63.2 %
Employed (in civilian LF)		61.6 % <sup>c</sup>		59.8 % <sup>c</sup>
Unemployed (in civilian LF)		5.0 % <sup>d</sup>		5.4 % <sup>d</sup>
Not in labor force		34.9 % <sup>c</sup>		36.5 % <sup>c</sup>
Mean hours worked		1932.6 <sup>e</sup>		1909.8 <sup>e</sup>
<b>Occupation</b>				
Employed persons 16 years and over	526,425	100.0 %	660,069	100.0 %
Mgmt, professional, related occupations				
		42.7 %		41.3 %
Service		11.8 %		12.1 %
Sales and office		30.2 %		30.0 %
Farming, fishing, and forestry		0.1 %		0.1 %
Construction, extraction, maintenance				
		5.2 %		5.6 %
Production, transportation, moving				
		9.8 %		10.6 %
Military		0.2 %		0.2 %
<b>INCOME in 1999</b>				
Households				
Median income (dollars)	48,200		46,700	
Mean income (dollars)	69,410		67,198	
<b>Poverty rate (all persons in household)</b>		13.3 %		14.1 %
<b>Household size</b>				
Average number of persons in household		2.9		2.9

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

<b>Marital status</b>				
Persons 15 years and over	866,630	100.0 %	1,117,908	100.0 %
Now married		57.6 %		57.6 %
Widowed		4.1 %		4.3 %
Divorced		7.1 %		7.0 %
Separated		1.4 %		1.6 %
Never married		29.9 %		29.5 %
<b>Number of own children under 18 years old living in household for women age 35-44<sup>f</sup></b>		1.8		1.8
<b>Age and sex</b>				
Male		54.3 %		54.2 %
Mean age		31.2		32.3
a=	d= Among 16 or older in civilian labor force			
Among foreign born people				
b=				
Among 5 or older.	e= Among 16 or older and employed			
c= Among 16 or older	f = Women who are householder or spouse of householder			

**Appendix F. Socio-demographic Differences Between Standard and Expanded Definitions of Mexican Population**

	<u>STANDARD DEFINITION</u> (Hispanic-Mexican)		<u>EXPANDED DEFINITION</u> (Hispanic-Mexican; Anc 1, 2; POB)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>Race</b>	20,881,890	100.0 %	23,003,362	100.0 %
White alone		47.3 %		47.6 %
White and another race		4.3 %		4.4 %
Black alone		0.9 %		1.1 %
Asian alone		0.4 %		0.4 %
Hawaii/PI/Native Am alone		1.4 %		1.5 %
Other race alone		45.5 %		44.8 %
All other combinations		0.2 %		0.2 %
<b>Nativity and Year of Entry</b>				
<b>All persons</b>	20,881,890	100.0 %	23,003,362	100.0 %
Native		58.5 %		59.6 %
Foreign born		41.5 %		40.5 %
Entered before 1990		51.1 %a		51.5 %a
Entered between 1990-2000		48.9 %a		48.5 %a
Naturalized citizen		22.1 %a		22.5 %a
Not a citizen		77.9 %a		77.5 %a
<b>Educational Attainment</b>				
Persons 25 years and over	10,172,857		11,195,714	
High school graduate or higher		45.8 %		46.6 %
Bachelor's degree or higher		7.5 %		7.6 %
Graduate degree or higher		2.4 %		2.5 %
<b>Ability to Speak English</b>				
Persons 5 years and over	18,497,271		20,371,164	

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

Speak other language at home		78.8 %		77.6 %
Do not speak English very well		43.1 % <sup>b</sup>		42.1 % <sup>b</sup>
Persons 5 years and over in households	18,133,477			19,983,394
In linguistically isolated households		26.4 %		25.6 %
<b>Labor Force Status</b>				
Persons 16 years and over	13,886,049			15,264,761
In civilian labor force		61.8 %		61.6 %
Employed (in civilian LF)		56.1 % <sup>c</sup>		55.8 % <sup>c</sup>
Unemployed (in civilian LF)		9.3 % <sup>d</sup>		9.3 % <sup>d</sup>
Not in labor force		37.8 % <sup>c</sup>		38.0 % <sup>c</sup>
Mean hours worked		1721.4 <sup>e</sup>		1720.9 <sup>e</sup>
<b>Occupation</b>				
Employed persons 16 years and over	7,839,715	100.0 %		8,584,854 100.0 %
Mgmt, professional, related occupations		15.0 %		15.3 %
Service		21.8 %		21.7 %
Sales and office		20.7 %		21.2 %
Farming, fishing, and forestry		4.0 %		3.8 %
Construction, extraction, and maintenance		15.2 %		15.0 %
Production, transportation, and material moving		23.0 %		22.7 %
Military		0.3 %		0.3 %
<b>INCOME in 1999</b>				
Households				
Median income (dollars)	33,500			33,400
Mean income (dollars)	42,842			42,860
<b>Poverty rate (all persons in household)</b>		23.2 %		23.0 %
<b>Household size</b>				
Average number of persons in household		3.9		3.9
<b>Marital status</b>				
Persons 15 years and over	14,238,020	100.0 %		15,654,881 100.0 %
Now married		53.4 %		53.2 %

Alternative Definitions of Mexican and Arab Identity: An Examination Across the Top Three Census Metropolitan Areas  
by Jen'nan Ghazal Read, Ph.D.

Widowed	2.9 %	3.0 %
Divorced	6.0 %	6.2 %
Separated	3.2 %	3.2 %
Never married	34.5 %	34.5 %
<b>Number of own children under 18 years old living in household for women age 35-44<sup>f</sup></b>	2.0	2.0
<b>Age and sex</b>		
Male	52.7 %	52.4 %
Mean age	26.0	26.0
a= Among those foreign born	d= Among those 16 or older in civilian labor force	
b= Among those 5 or older	e= Among those 16 or older and employed	
c= Among those 16 or older	f = Among those householder or spouse of householder	